

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

The status of the claims is summarized as:

Claims 1-11, 13-33, 35-59, and 61-68 were previously pending.

Claims 1-4, 10, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 23-26, 49-51, 53-57, and 68 are currently amended.

Claims 5-9, 12-13, 16, 18, 21-22, 27-48, 52, and 58-67 are canceled.

Claims 1-4, 10-11, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 23-26, 49-51, 53-57, and 68 are pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office rejects claims 1-11, 13-20, 27, 32-33, 35-38, 43, 47-48, 58-59, and 61-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klevenz (US Publication 2003/0137540) in view of Nadav (NPL, Introducing DHTML Behaviors, Nov 18, 1998, pgs 1-11). However, claims 5-9, 13, 16, 18, 27, 32-33, 35-38, 43, 47-48, 58-59, and 61-67 are canceled. This leaves claims 1-4, 10-11, 14-15, 17, 19-20, and 68 remaining and rejected.

The Office rejects claims 21-26, 28-31, 39-42, 44-46, and 49-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klevenz in view of Nadav and further in view of Cecco (US Patent No. 6,310,631). However, Claims 21-22, 28-31, 39-

1 42, 44-46, and 52 are canceled. This leaves claims 23-26, 49-51, and 53-57
2 remaining and rejected.

3 Klevenz teaches systems and techniques for managing a user interface,
4 while the Nadav reference introduces dHTML behaviors and the Cecco reference
5 teaches a user interface control for creating split panes in a single window.

6
7 **Claim 1**

8 Claim 1, as amended, defines a computer-executable method that includes:

- 9
- 10 • executing a pane element comprising an element behavior, wherein
11 the pane element comprises a single element that is readable from a
12 document by a browser, and wherein the executing includes
13 invoking logic associated with the element behavior;
 - 14 • parsing and initializing the logic to synchronously bind the logic to
15 the pane element, wherein the logic specifies at least some attributes
16 of one or more panes, and wherein the bound logic renders the pane
17 element into a hypertext markup language (HTML) element to
18 which the element behavior is irreversibly bound;
 - 19 • executing the HTML element to generate the one or more panes
20 having the specified attributes;
 - 21 • wherein the bound logic manages display attributes of the one or
22 more panes including a position, a size, and a shape for each pane;
 - 23 • wherein the bound logic manages linkages between the one or more
24 panes and one or more content resources, such that:
 - 25 ○ when only one pane exists then a changing content displayed
in the pane is dynamically stored in the content resource in order to
initialize subsequent additional panes with the same content;
 - when multiple panes exist the content that is common to the
multiple panes is dynamically linked between the panes in order to
propagate edits in the content simultaneously between the panes; and
 - when multiple panes each possess a link to a common content
resource, then input from the common content resource and changes

1 to the common content resource are simultaneously implemented in
2 the multiple panes.

3 For an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the references
4 combined to make the rejection must teach or suggest every element of the
5 Applicant's claim. The combined references of Klevenz and Nadav do not teach or
6 suggest each element of Applicant's amended claim 1. For example, the
7 combination does not teach or suggest multiple capabilities combined into one single
8 markup language element, that is to say: a) automatic management of the display
9 attributes of one pane or multiple interrelated panes *vis-à-vis changing content that is*
10 *common* between the panes; b) automatic management of changing displayed
11 content common to multiple panes and linked between the panes and one or more
12 content resources, such as a file, a keyboard input, etc., such that content changes are
13 propagated throughout linked panes and content resources; c) wherein the two
14 capabilities a) and b) just described are permanently bound to the single "pane
15 element" markup language element and available through this single "command."

16 The method of claim 1—the "pane element"—saves novice web page
17 programmers enormous amounts of time. With respect to the Klevenz reference, but
18 perhaps especially with respect to the Nadav reference, dynamic HTML (DHTML)
19 and web scripting have increased the capability of HTML and other languages that
20 are popular for creating web pages to perform with more sophisticated
21 interactivity. But this improvement still does not approach that of software
22 application GUIs, especially with respect to web pages used with different types of
23 browsers. A web page author contemplating either a sophisticated GUI or a
24 customized window in a web page has limited choices: write additional web
25

1 pages to create entirely separate windows (serious programming commitment), or
2 use "canned" web page code to make stock windows (not very customizable).
3 Writing another web page, to be created as an entirely separate window, e.g., for
4 an interactive dialogue, complicates accessing variables and/or content on the
5 primary web page originating the new web page window and requires the web
6 page developer to write event-trapping code to invoke the dialogue.

7 On the other hand, executing the pane element of Applicant's claim 1 frees
8 the web page author from these tasks. It should be noted with regard to the
9 obviousness rejection, that if combining references such as Klevenz and Nadav to
10 obtain Applicant's claim 1 were obvious, why would web page authors at the time
11 of Applicant's filing still be going to the great trouble of manually writing
12 additional web pages to create each additional pane?

13 Since Klevenz and Nadav, either alone or in combination, do not teach or
14 suggest each element of Applicant's claim 1, Applicant submits that the
15 combination fails under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and that claim 1 is allowable over the
16 cited references.

17 18 **Claims 2-4**

19 For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant
20 submits that dependent claims 2-4 are also allowable over the Klevenz and Nadav
21 references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they
22 depend. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, therefore Applicant submits that these
23 claims are allowable.
24
25

Claim 10

Claim 10, as amended, defines a computer-executable method that includes:

- reading a pane element comprising an element behavior in a web page document for producing a web page;
- executing the pane element wherein the executing invokes logic synchronously bound with the pane element, wherein the bound logic specifies at least some attributes of one or more panes;
- wherein the executing generates the one or more panes having the specified attributes;
- wherein the bound logic manages display attributes of the one or more panes including a position, a size, and a shape for each pane;
- wherein the bound logic manages a linkage between the one or more panes and one or more content resources, such that changes to content that is common between one or more panes and the one or more content resources is simultaneously updated in each of the panes and in each of the content resources.

For reasons similar to those presented above for claim 1, the combined references of Klevenz and Nadav do not teach or suggest each element of Applicant's amended claim 10. Again, the combination does not teach or suggest the claimed multiple capabilities combined into one single markup language element, that is to say: a) automatic management of the display attributes of one pane or multiple interrelated panes *vis-à-vis changing content that is common* between the panes; b) automatic management of changing displayed content common to multiple panes and linked between the panes and one or more content resources, such as a file, a keyboard input, etc., such that content changes are propagated throughout

1 linked panes and content resources; c) wherein the two capabilities a) and b) just
2 described are permanently bound to the single "pane element" markup language
3 element and available through this single "command." Yet, for an obviousness
4 rejection to succeed under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the combined references must teach
5 or suggest every element of the Applicant's claim.

6 Since Klevenz and Nadav, either alone or in combination, do not teach or
7 suggest each element of Applicant's claim 10, Applicant submits that the
8 combination fails under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and that claim 1 is allowable over the
9 cited references.

10
11 **Claims 11, 14-15, 17, 19-20**

12 For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 10, Applicant
13 submits that dependent claims 14-15, 17, 19-20 are also allowable over the
14 Klevenz and Nadav references. Dependent claims contain the language of the
15 claims from which they depend. Claims 14-15, 17, 19-20 depend from claim 10,
16 therefore Applicant submits that these claims are allowable.

17
18 **Claim 49**

19 Claim 49, as amended, defines a computer-executable pane engine
20 addressable via execution of a pane element for generating one or more
21 interrelated panes in a web page, wherein the pane engine comprises a parsed and
22 initiated element behavior bound to the pane element, including:

- a pane attribute assignor;
- a pane sizer;
- a pane positioner;
- a multipane coordinator to manage interrelations between attributes of multiple panes being concurrently displayed on a user interface;
 - a dynamic content linker in the multipane coordinator to dynamically link a content that is common between multiple panes, wherein edits in the content of one pane are simultaneously propagated to the other panes; and
 - a common resource linker for multiple panes that each possess a link to a common content resource, wherein the common resource linker sends input from the common content resource to the multiple panes.

Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco are combined to make the obviousness rejection of claim 49. Cecco teaches an improved method for creating and sizing panes within a window of a computer system display screen as part of an interactive graphical user interface (Cecco, Abstract). The method in Cecco provides a user-controlled means to display a variable rectangle on a computer screen and to control where a new pane will appear **by user-movement of the cursor** to change the size and position of the variable form (Cecco, col. 3, lines 5-9). Thus, Cecco describes manual, interactive layout of panes, in which the user appears as part of the technique.

For an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the references combined to make the rejection must teach or suggest every element of the Applicant's claim. The combined references of Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco do not

1 teach or suggest each element of Applicant's amended claim 49. For example, the
2 combination does not teach or suggest a multipane coordinator (see Applicant's Fig.
3 10) that has a dynamic content linker (see Fig. 10) to dynamically link a content
4 that is common between multiple panes, wherein edits in the content of one pane
5 are simultaneously propagated to the other panes; and a common resource linker
6 (see Fig. 10) for multiple panes that each possess a link to a common content
7 resource, wherein the common resource linker sends input from the common
8 content resource to the multiple panes.

9 Applicant's pane engine is an element behavior, which when parsed and
10 initiated, renders the "pane element" into a permanent, standalone HTML element.
11 Thus, by incorporating a single pane element in a web page document, a web page
12 author has at his disposal and subsequently unleashes all the capabilities of the
13 multipane coordinator, the dynamic content linker, and the common resource
14 linker, without having to write a new page for each window—i.e., without having
15 to manually track and account for all the pane attribute variables that have to be
16 juggled between pages when writing custom code for each pane—that is, when
17 authoring panes without Applicant's pane element.

18 Since Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco, either alone or in combination, do not
19 teach or suggest each element of Applicant's claim 49, Applicant submits that the
20 combination fails under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and that claim 49 is allowable over the
21 cited references.

Claims 50-51, 53-57, and 68

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 49, Applicant submits that dependent claims 50-51, 53-57, and 68 are also allowable over the Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 50-51, 53-57, and 68 depend from claim 49, therefore Applicant submits that these claims are allowable.

Claims 23-26

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of a combination of Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco. Applicant submits above that amended base claim 10 is allowable. Because dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 23-26 are also allowable.

Additionally, Klevenz, Nadav, and Cecco, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of Applicant's claims 23-26 including their base claim 10. That is, Cecco does not provide teaching that is missing in Klevenz and Nadav, that would describe each element of Applicant's claims 23-26 including base claim 10. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-26 are allowable.

Conclusion

All pending claims 1-4, 10-11, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 23-26, 49-51, 53-57, and 68 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent

1 issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned
2 attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

3
4
5 Respectfully Submitted,

6
7 Dated: July 3, 2006

8 By: /Mark Farrell/

9 Mark Farrell
10 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
11 Reg. No. 45,988
12 Attorney for Applicant

13 LEE & HAYES PLLC
14 Suite 500
15 421 W. Riverside Avenue
16 Spokane, Washington 99201
17 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x243
18 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
19
20
21
22
23
24
25